

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| 09/425,592 | 10/22/1999 | HONG HEATHER YU | 9432-000084 | 9761 | |
| 75 | 590 02/20/2003 | | | | |
| HARNESS DICKEY & PIERCE PLC | | | EXAMINER | | |
| P O BOX 828 BLOOMFIELD | HILLS, MI 48303 | | HEWITT II, | HEWITT II, CALVIN L | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 3621 | | |

DATE MAILED: 02/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| ~ | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------------|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/425,592 | YU ET AL. | | | | |
| ,,, | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Calvin L Hewitt II | 3621 | Ψ. | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence addi | ress | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 05 February 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (*condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | void abandonment of this application to the same of th | cation. A proper rep ch places the applic | oly to a cation in | | | |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | | | | | |
| (a) $oxed{oxed}$ they raise new issues that would require furth | er consideration and/or search (| (see NOTE below); | | | | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or | in better form for appeal by mat | erially reducing or s | simplifying the | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without cancel | ling a corresponding number of | finally rejected clair | ns. | | | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection. | tion(s): | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a s | eparate, timely filed | d amendment | | | |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: | r reconsideration has been cons | sidered but does NC | OT place the | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | cause it is not directed SOLELY | to issues which we | re newly | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w | | | and an | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is | | proved by the Exam | niner. | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). | | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | | | | |
| | JAMES P. TRAMMELL | | | | | |
| | CUDEDVISORY PATENT EXAMI | NER | | | | |
| S. Patent and Trademark Office | TECHNOLOGY CENTER 360 | <u> </u> | | | | |





Continuation of 2. NOTE: The new feature of extracting the active hidden data and the control data from the embedded data stream has been added and requires further search. In addition the Examiner would like to address the Applicant' comments regarding claim 12. The Applicant has stated that neither Barton nor Moskowitz detail "error correction data to ensure the errorless extractability of the digital signature" (paper No. 7, page 6). However, this limitation is not found in claim 12. Perhaps the claims should be amended to include this feature.